The Project: Agonistic Human Ontology

Indexed: *PhilPapers / PhilArchive*

Human Personality and Person – An Ontological-Agonistic Perspective and New Categorial Interpretations: Temperament, Character, Profile, Work, Fulfillment, Happiness, Social Conduct

Petru Stefaroi

Abstract: The article proposes an **ontological-agonistic** perspective on personality and the human person, challenging deterministic and computational models through a vision in which these are the result of a **perpetual tension** between constitutive onto-formations: organism, mind, soul, ego, and consciousness. Within this framework, personality is not understood as a pacified unity, but as a **structural antagonism**, where temperament provides the collision energy, and character acts as a hierarchical force that forges a **tensional profile**, capable of resisting centrifugal tendencies. The work analyzes the transition toward the person as a **qualitative leap** toward a sovereign agency, in which waking consciousness suspends instinctual automatism to impose a meaning upon one's own path through **self-transcendence** and ontic responsibility. This perspective reinterprets the fundamental categories of existence: work becomes the space for ordering material chaos through effort, while fulfillment and happiness are wrested from the dynamics of these internal resistances, being defined as **plenitudes of mastering the agon**, not as its absences. Furthermore, social conduct is defined as an act of affirming uniqueness and an **intersubjective presence** marked by sovereignty, offering a dam against the pressures of systemic uniformization. Although the model recognizes the limits of neglecting relaxation, it grounds a vision in which the person validates themselves exclusively through the **maximum activation** of internal resources in the hearth of structural conflict. This state of permanent mobilization is proposed as the only viable alternative in the face of contemporary **identity dissolution**, a crisis caused by the externalization of decision-making and the atrophy of inner effort. By refusing facile harmony and embracing the agonism between onto-formations, subjectivity regains its **ontic density**, transforming willful tension with the self and the world into an irreducible barrier against fragmentation and non-existence masked by comfort.

Keywords: Ontology, Ontological agonism, Internal tensions, Personality, Human person, Temperament, Character, Identity profile, Promergence, Dysmergence, Ontification of agency, Ontic responsibility, Work, Fulfillment, Happiness, Social conduct.

Introduction

Is human identity a mere sum of biological algorithms or the result of a ceaseless struggle for form amidst inner chaos? How can we explain the fact that, despite genetic determinism and environmental pressure, the emergence of a core of will can suspend the automatic mechanisms of instinct? If personality were merely a static architecture of data, why do we feel the permanent fracture between who we are by temperament and who we strive to become through the conscious effort of character? These inquiries target the heart of the relationship between biological data and the spiritual exigency of the person, unmasking the fragility of computational models that ignore the visceral internal tensions defining the human experience.

The current tendency to "map" interiority through the lens of technical efficiency tends to obscure the tensional antagonism that fractures the order of the ego, leaving unexplained the drive toward disorder or the effort to assimilate those antagonisms that threaten the stability of the living system. In a manner resonating with Martin Heidegger’s critique of the "forgetfulness of Being," identity-based unity does not appear as a technical given, but as an existence in perpetual confrontation with its own finitude. The fundamental dilemma resides in the fracture between linear becoming and the ontological abyss between raw biological impulse and self-imposed rigor; omitting the tensional dimension of self-constitution ignores the fact that becoming implies a collision with the void of one's own fragmentation in order to crystallize a coherent profile.

In this sense, Max Scheler’s philosophical anthropology provides a solid foundation by defining the capacity to utter a tensional "No" in the face of one's own vital impulses—the fundamental gesture through which internal resistance becomes the foundation upon which the person is instituted. The evolution of explanatory models reveals a historical effort to domesticate the blind forces of the psyche through rigid categories; however, the gamble on stability has failed to capture the virulence of the antagonistic processes that sustain the unity of the ego. Reducing the psyche to a homeostatic process ignores the material resistance that onto-formations oppose to integration, validating Viktor Frankl’s critique of "pan-determinism," which deprives the individual of the space for decision-making assumed through work and conscious effort.

An onto-agonistic perspective proposes understanding this journey not as a pre-established harmony, but as a vital confrontation between the forces of integration and those of dissolution. Redefining the categories of temperament, character, and profile through the prism of the "agon" highlights the structural tension in which promergence tends to subordinate divergent instincts. The person self-generates in the hearth of a permanent confrontation, where work, fulfillment, and happiness become benchmarks of a sovereignty conquered over one's own internal tensions, and social conduct becomes the supreme expression of uniqueness in the face of any leveling pressure. This dynamic necessitates an exploration of the roots of conflict within the depths of the Personal Ontos—the site where personality is transfigured through agency and ontic responsibility.

The Personal Ontos: An Agonistic Multiple of Onto-formations and the Ontological Framework for Structuring Personality and Instituting the Person

Constituted as an **agonistic multiple of onto-formations**, the **Personal Ontos** subsists through a relentless clashing of its internal forces, serving as the collision space where the dimensions of being perpetually dispute their right to dominate the center of decision-making. Within this core, elements do not coexist peacefully; they collide in a **power dynamic** in which the **Body** exerts the constant pressure of material impulse, while the **Mind** seeks dominance through calculation and logic, and the **Soul** imposes the intensity of the affective flow. Above these, the **Ego** intervenes not as a passive observer, but as a commanding authority attempting to impose the rigor of an axiological norm. Such a confrontation draws directly upon Plato’s tripartite model of the soul, where unity results only from the **agonistic effort** of reason to discipline the "wild horses" of desire. The architecture of the Personal Ontos is, therefore, precarious, maintained only by the Ego’s capacity to hierarchize forces that, left to their own inertia, would violently repel each other or fragment the being into contradictory drives.

This **ontic reality** thickens through the resistance it offers to every internal tendency toward disintegration. The structure fortifies itself in the process of compensating for any fissure—a central idea in the psychology of Alfred Adler, who argued that the being is constructed through the struggle with its own sense of inferiority, transforming the tension between weakness and will into a motor of affirmation. The development of this core is governed by the **structural antagonism** between **promergence**, as the force of integration, and **dismergence**, as the tendency toward dissipation. Becoming does not follow a linear path; instead, it manifests as a deployment through **breaking tension**,

reminiscent of Heraclitus' principle that *Polemos* (conflict) is the father of all things, where harmony is the result of opposing forces held under maximum pressure.

The present density is forged in the refusal to surrender to the **dismergent force**—that instinct which, in Sigmund Freud's terms, reflects the **Thanatos** drive, tending toward the annihilation of form and a return to the indistinction of inanimate matter. The Personal Ontos is defined by the Ego's power to assimilate the pressure of these internal vectors and convert them into **character resistance**, a process that finds a counterpart in the anthropology of Max Scheler, where man is defined as the being capable of saying "No" to the vital current in order to institute a higher order. The dialectic of forces branches out across levels where bodily impulses systematically assault the architecture built by the Mind, forcing the subject to choose between pulsional relaxation and **structural rigor**, a relationship that forms the basis of Kantian ethics, where duty clashes head-on with sensible inclinations.

The institution of order through the **hierarchization of onto-formations** is not a singular event, but a continuous process of organization through which the Ego exercises its authority, analogous to Abraham Maslow's theory, which requires the being to actively prioritize growth needs over the "gravity" of basic needs. Such an effort to transmute the chaos of primordial forces into an **internal "Cosmos"** resonates with Mircea Eliade's vision regarding the necessity of establishing a rigorous order against the dispersion of blind impulses. Ultimately, the Personal Ontos does not appear as a passive structure, but as the unitary result of these forces in unceasing confrontation, where no dimension of being is consolidated without having been won against a contrary tendency.

The dynamic organization of onto-formations takes on dramatic overtones, reminiscent of the character Harry Haller in Hermann Hesse's *Steppenwolf*—a meeting ground for thousands of souls and opposing tendencies that must be coordinated at the cost of a creative unrest. The **densification of the agonistic multiple** through this continuous struggle of internal forces—where the Mind provides the logical toolkit and the Ego the sovereign direction—constitutes the necessary foundation upon which the **personality profile** is built.

Human Personality from an Onto-Agonistic Perspective and New Categorial Interpretations: Temperament, Character, and Personality Profile

Human personality stands at the intersection of a head-on collision between the constitutive forces of being, representing the result of a permanent **structuring tension** rather than a state of affairs or a tranquil biological given. In this intersectional space, internal **onto-formations**—the Body, the Mind, and the Soul—exist in a state of unceasing confrontation for decisional territory and ontic authority. This process resonates with the tripartite model of the soul proposed by Plato in *The Republic*, where reason (*Logistikon*) must discipline, in fierce competition, the divergent forces of desire (*Epithymetikon*) and spiritedness (*Thymos*). Such a dynamic generates a fragile armistice between primordial drives and ethical demands, a process that in Sigmund Freud's psychoanalysis defines the very survival of the **Ego** as a mediator between the pulsional pressures of the Id and the moral censorship of the Superego. This architecture of the ego is not a shelter but a point of maximum pressure where centrifugal tendencies are held together by the exercise of a superior **centripetal force**, transforming potential fragmentation into a forced yet necessary cohesion for the subsistence of identity.

This cohesion is never definitive; it requires a perpetual reactivation of the will to be "one" in the face of the multiplicity of impulses assailing the command center. Far from being a harmonious construct or a perfectly balanced homeostatic system, personality represents the ontological form maintained exclusively through the **agonistic effort** to integrate elements that, left to their own inertia, would violently repel each other. It fortifies itself precisely through an assumed confrontation with internal vulnerabilities—an idea that grounds Alfred Adler’s individual psychology, according to which personality crystallizes through the compensation of inferiority feelings, transforming inner resistance into an agonistic engine of self-affirmation. The strength of this structure derives not from the absence of conflict, but from its capacity to assimilate it, converting internal collision into a vital energy that propels the subject toward an increasingly dense presence in the world—a presence that does not accept mere survival but seeks affirmation through **self-mastery**, in the spirit of Friedrich Nietzsche’s "will to power," interpreted here as the self-overcoming of one's own biological condition.

Structural Ontological Agonism: Between Integrative Promergence and Entropic Dismergence

The development of personality is governed by a radical antagonism between **promergence**, as a force of integration and densification, and **dismergence**, as an irrepressible tendency toward fragmentation and decomposition. In this agonistic framework, personality does not represent a natural, predictable, or smooth growth, but a deployment through **extreme structural tension**, where every evolutionary leap is the result of a crisis of ontological proportions that forces the reconfiguration of the entire system. This tensional dynamic, in which internal onto-formations—organism, mind, soul, and ego—clash in a

permanent collision, refers directly to Heraclitus' principle that *Polemos* (confrontation) is the father of all things. Thus, the architecture of personality is born from a **tensed harmony** of opposing forces, much like a bowstring that can produce sound only under a pressure that tends toward breaking, signifying that identity is not a given, but a conquest achieved through the effort of not allowing one component to annihilate the whole.

The evolution of personality does not constitute a quantitative accumulation of traits, but a succession of **agonistic victories** of promergence over tendencies toward dispersion—a process mirroring G.W.F. Hegel’s dialectic, where identity synthesis is not obtained by avoiding conflict, but by negating and overcoming the fundamental contradictions between divergent onto-formations. Personality is thus defined as a **tensional profile**, being all the denser the more it manages to assimilate antagonistic forces without being torn apart by them. Conversely, dismergence permanently promises the personality a relaxation of tension through total abandonment to impulse, representing a seductive form of involution toward indistinction and loss of form. This force acts unceasingly toward the annihilation of structure, undermining any attempt at organization through a magnetic attraction toward disorder—the ontological equivalent of Freud’s **Thanatos** drive, that tendency of living matter to return to an inorganic state, to the absolute repose of formlessness.

Dismergence is the temptation of psychic entropy, the call toward a "sleep" of character where the effort to sustain one's profile is abandoned in favor of biological inertia or social mimicry. Consequently, personality validates itself through its capacity to inhabit this structural antagonism without being absorbed by the **dismergent reflux**, transforming internal pressure into **ontological density** and forging a structure capable of resisting the gravitational pull of its own internal collapses. Resistance to this reflux is not a behavioral option, but the *sine qua non* condition for the ego’s subsistence, mirroring Jean-Paul Sartre’s philosophy where existence precedes essence: personality has no pre-established essence to save it, but must build its own solidity through the ceaseless refusal of inertia. In the onto-agonistic view, the subsistence of personality is an act of **continuous insurrection** of promergence against randomness—a form maintained at the cost of immense tension against the dismergent current, validating its reality through the very intensity with which it refuses to decompose into its constituent onto-formations, thereby preparing the ground for the emergence of the **person** as a sovereign agency.

Temperament: The Original Ground of Confrontation and the Structural Agonism of Living Matter

Temperament ceases to be viewed merely as a neutral biological heritage or a set of immutable physiological constants; from an onto-agonistic

perspective, it reveals itself as the original **"hearth" of confrontation** and the structural agonism of living matter. It provides the intensity, rhythm, and speed of underlying reactions that the person must domesticate through volitional effort, representing the **primary resistance** of the organic onto-formation in the face of the spirit. This raw force, if left unguided, naturally tends toward dismergence and blind reactivity; however, under the pressure of a sovereign will, it is converted into indispensable fuel for personal action. Thus, the tradition of temperamental typologies—from the intuitions of Hippocrates and Galen to the dimensional models of Hans Eysenck—is reinterpreted not as a mapping of fixed traits, but as an inventory of **pulsional forces** that must be subordinated to an axiological order.

In this process of identity configuration, temperamental traits—whether the impulsivity of the choleric or the inertia of the phlegmatic—do not constitute biological destinies, but **ontic challenges** that force the subject to transform organic predisposition into the foundation of a conduct assumed through mental effort. This dynamic resonates deeply with Max Scheler’s philosophical anthropology, which defined the capacity to say an agonistic "No" to the vital current as the act through which a higher order is established. Biological vitality must necessarily be "burned" and transfigured to produce spiritual light; temperament is the **critical mass of energy** which, though permanently threatening to destabilize the ego’s fragile equilibrium through its dismergent forces, simultaneously provides the raw power necessary to sustain the tension of existence.

Therefore, the education of temperament is not reduced to simple social modeling or behavioral training, but represents a **metaphysical act of disciplining organic chaos**. It is a victory of structural promergence over the unceasing pulsional flow, a process reminiscent of the transformation of the Bergsonian *élan vital* into an assumed self-creation. Temperament thus provides the **agonistic construction material**, while character intervenes as the architectural hand that imposes form upon this incandescent matter, transforming a physiological accident into a manifestation of the **person's sovereignty**. Without this resistance from temperament, personality would lack density, yet without its agonistic subordination, it would dissolve into biological automatism, failing the leap toward the status of a person.

Character: The Architecture of Agonistic Order and the Triumph of Internal Hierarchization Through Fierce Confrontation

Character represents the visible and consolidated result of the **hierarchization of internal forces**, being the triumph of agonistic order over centrifugal drives that tend to fragment the unity of being into a thousand contradictory directions. It is not a given, but a **structure conquered through perseverance**, representing the ego’s capacity to impose a sovereign command center over blind impulses and to transform

biological necessity into **ethical freedom** through rigorous self-discipline. Character is forged exclusively in moments of opposition, where duty clashes head-on with inclination, serving as the exact measure of the subject's resistance to their own **moral entropy**—a process grounding Kantian ethics, where the categorical imperative prevails despite sensible desires. This struggle reflects the "secular asceticism" described by Max Weber, where the individual subordinates their entire psycho-biological life to a transcendent goal, transforming every gesture into a battle for rigor.

This hierarchization is not a static state, but an **agonistic power dynamic** that must be reaffirmed in every act of will, a process reminiscent of Abraham Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, where **self-actualization** demands a constant victory over the gravity exerted by basic needs. Character thus becomes the **ontological backbone** of personality, the instance that prevents the collapse of being into indistinction and allows the subject to remain identical to oneself despite external pressures or internal refluxes, validating Søren Kierkegaard’s critique of the "crowd" that crushes individuality. This structural stability resonates with Ludwig Klages' concept of "characterology," yet without its fatalism, emphasizing the spirit's power to oppose "life" when it tends toward disorder.

To have character means, in this sense, to have succeeded in imposing a **promergent meaning** where nature provided only conflictual multiplicity, transforming the tension between "what I am" (the factual given) and "what I must be" (the chosen norm) into a force of impact upon the world. This transfiguration brings to mind the process of "sublimation" in Freud’s theory, where raw pulsional energy is refined toward the creation of higher values, or the "lifestyle" described by Alfred Adler, viewed as an effort to compensate for original fragility through a will to perfection. Character is not, therefore, what we "possess," but what we have managed to keep intact and fortify in the **fierce hearth of our own fundamental contradictions**, being the ultimate proof of the ego's **ontic resistance** against disintegration.

Finally, this architecture of the will functions as a mechanism for the **ontification of agency**, integrating what Viktor Frankl called the "capacity for self-transcendence"—the power of man to rise above his biological and social conditioning. By assimilating the agonism between onto-formations, character transfigures structural stress into **identity density**, granting the person the capacity to exercise real sovereignty. It is the definitive victory of assumed form against the amorphous flow, a synthesis reminiscent of Friedrich Nietzsche’s ideal of the "noble man," who gives himself his own law and transforms his existence into a work of art through self-control and an assumed hardness toward oneself, converting the internal battle into the foundation of an **authoritative presence**.

The Personality Profile: The Tensional Synthesis of Agonistic Multiplicity

A personality profile does not represent a mere list of passive traits or a collection of static adjectives; it is constituted as the **unitary, tensional, and dynamic result** of internal forces maintained in a state of permanent reciprocal pressure. From this perspective, it reflects the specific configuration of collisions between onto-formations, being a **dynamic organization** that subsists only as long as the ego's center of gravity can sustain the tension between spirit and instinct. In the agonistic view, no profile trait can be considered authentic unless it has been won through direct confrontation with a contrary tendency; generosity is valid only if it has defeated biological egoism, and courage gains ontic weight only if it has disciplined organic fear. This view correlates with Gordon Allport's trait theory but places the emphasis on the **vital conflict** that sustains the structure, rather than on its mere statistical or behavioral description.

Identity thus sediments exclusively through the capacity to sustain this **structural antagonism** without fragmenting the central core of being, transforming the personal profile from a receptacle of external influences into a **center of meaning radiation**. This synthesis reflects the fierce multiplicity of elements clashing within the same subject—reminiscent of the profound split in the character Harry Haller from Hermann Hesse's *Steppenwolf*—and imposes an unceasing coordination of contradictions to prevent **identity dissolution**. The process demands an integration of the "shadow," as described by Carl Jung, forcing the subject not to repress opposing poles but to master them within a superior unity. A personality is considered structured only when it manages to channel the raw energy of internal antagonisms toward a unitary goal, transfiguring the collision of forces into existential meaning and concentrated power of action.

In relation to established psychometric models, such as the **Big Five**, the agonistic vision proposes a fundamental rupture: where classical psychology sees traits to be measured, we see **tensions to be mastered**. While standard tests descriptively map predispositions such as emotional stability or openness, the agonistic model views these dimensions as battlefields. For example, a high score in "agreeableness" is not seen as an innate trait, but as a victory of **social promergence** over the organism's selfish impulses—a conquest that must be defended in every interaction to avoid degenerating into passive conformism. This establishment of order represents an act of instituting an **inner cosmos**, analogous to Mircea Eliade's vision of the necessity of establishing the sacred as a primordial order against the profane understood as disorder and haos.

Unlike the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), which tends to classify individuals into static categories based on cognitive preferences, the agonistic profile denies the definitive character of these "types," viewing

them only as starting points for a violent effort to integrate inferior functions. If we refer to Hans Eysenck's temperamental typologies, which ground personality in neurophysiological bases, our vision accepts the existence of this substrate but places it in the category of **dismergent raw material**. An individual with a high degree of neuroticism is not a prisoner of the nervous system, but a subject faced with greater pressure from the organic onto-formation, whose mission is to forge a robust character to compensate for biological lability, thus validating Alfred Adler's thesis on **overcompensation** through which the spirit dominates original fragility.

In opposition to Martin Seligman's **positive psychology**, the agonistic profile maintains that "strengths" are not resources to be simply inventoried, but results of an **ontological resistance training**. Personality recognizes itself to the extent that it opposes its own regressive impulses, transforming the personal profile from a receptacle into a **tensional fortress**. This dynamic resonates with Kurt Lewin's idea of the "psychological field," but recharged with a dimension of **moral sovereignty**, where the subject does not limit themselves to reacting to the environment but imposes upon the world the configuration of their own **internal hierarchy**. The profile thus becomes the image of a creative armistice that refuses static stability in favor of a becoming under pressure, maintained through the **ontological vigilance** described by G.W.F. Hegel.

Ultimately, the personality profile is the existential proof of the human capacity to generate **unity from multiplicity**, transforming the internal battle into an inalienable sovereignty. This achievement reflects the distinction between "individual" and "person" made by Emmanuel Mounier, where the person affirms themselves through commitment and the refusal to be a mere numerical unit or a "score" in a database. The agonistic profile is the **signature of our uniqueness**, engraved in the fierce hearth of the conflict between onto-formations, representing the only legitimate form of stability in a universe governed by flux. Through this internal cosmos, man ceases to be a mere biological accident and becomes an **assumed ontological necessity** through the strength of their own order—a structure that fortifies itself as the obstacles encountered become greater.

The Person from an Onto-Agonistic Perspective and New Categorial Interpretations: Consciousness, Agency, Freedom, Fulfillment and Happiness, Social Conduct

The **person** is built upon the foundation of personality but is instituted as a **sovereign instance** of transcending its determinisms, representing the

radical act of tearing oneself away from the mechanism through direct confrontation with one's own biological and psychic limits. It is not a natural given, but a **tensional emergence**, a victory of the will over inertia—a vision supported by the personalist anthropology of Emmanuel Mounier, who sees the person as a movement of permanent self-transcendence, opposed to the passive and amorphous individual who lets themselves be shaped by circumstances. In this perspective, the being transitions from the stage of a mere aggregate of traits to that of an **ontic subject** only through its capacity to fight for values and to impose a meaning where nature left only instinct, transforming every barrier into a step of its own ascent. The person thus becomes an entity that no longer "suffers" life but assumes it as an **agonistic project**, where identity is not a static refuge but a relentless assault on the limitations of the human condition. This transformation of the being from a receptacle of impulses into a command center marks the moment when the subject ceases to be a mere battlefield and becomes the force that dictates the terms of the confrontation.

This sovereignty is not installed in a vacuum but presupposes a painful wrenching from the flow of **blind causality**, an act by which the subject claims the right to be the cause of its own transformation, instituting a regime of **autonomy** where previously only biological determinism reigned. The person is, essentially, a process of **agonistic self-creation** that refuses stagnation and the mechanical repetition of gestures emptied of content, resonating with Henri Bergson’s vision of the *élan vital* which must face the resistance of matter to affirm its freedom. By transforming the internal conflict between the impulses of the onto-formations into a creative force, the being crystallizes a **hard core of presence**, capable of sustaining the weight of a self-consciousness that no longer accepts fragmentation. This core becomes the only real barrier against "**dismergence**"—the entropic tendency to return to the state of a will-less object—forging an identity defined by its resistance to leveling. This densification of the self prepares the subject for the total assumption of its acts, transforming fatality into **assumed destiny**.

By virtue of this refusal to capitulate before inertia, the person does not seek excuses in genetic heritage, social environment, or the sedimented traumas of the past, assuming their presence as a fact accomplished exclusively through **unwavering inner rigor**. This attitude mirrors the "courage to be" described by Paul Tillich—the ontological power to face nothingness and anxiety by assuming one's own tensed and paradoxical existence, without seeking solace in the lukewarm conformism of the masses. **Responsibility** thus becomes a fundamental ontological axis that prevents the subject's collapse into the irresponsible anonymity of the species, instituting a moral instance that has defeated internal chaos through **fierce self-discipline**—a process reminiscent of Albert Camus’ "rebel," whose dignity resides precisely in the refusal to yield to absurd disorder. This assumed moral unity constitutes the only real basis upon which an **authentic act of will** can be built, transforming the necessity

to act into a manifestation of freedom that necessarily begins with the activation of a waking consciousness.

Consciousness: The Agonistic Watchtower and the Refusal of Ontic Drowsiness

In this agonistic framework, **consciousness** must not be understood as a mere passive screen reflecting reality or as a residual neuronal byproduct, but as an **active instance of vigilance** established through the unceasing refusal of identity "sleep." It is not a given, but a second-by-second conquest, representing the point of maximum tension where the subject recognizes its own internal multiplicity and, instead of being fragmented by it, decides to govern it. This dynamic transforms what G.W.F. Hegel called in the *Phenomenology of Spirit* the "**unhappy consciousness**"—that instance painfully split between the finite and the infinite, between drive and ideal—into an engine of higher synthesis, where conflict becomes the source of structuring power.

Agonistic consciousness functions as an unyielding mental dam against the dismergent forces that tend to dissolve the integrity of the ego into atomized drives. To be conscious, in this sense, means to keep awake the contradiction between impulse and norm, refusing any form of homeostatic simplification or inner "peace" that would mask the spirit's capitulation. This perspective extends Edmund Husserl's concepts of **intentionality**, suggesting that any act of consciousness is not just an orientation toward the world, but an assault upon the object and a violent demarcation from the instinctive self. Consciousness does not "receive" the world; it "masters" it through **attention** that selects, hierarchizes, and rejects.

Far from being a state of grace or contemplative stillness, consciousness is one of **permanent mobilization**, similar to the state of assiduous vigilance (*prosoche*) in Stoic doctrines. For the Stoics, as for the onto-agonistic model, uninterrupted attention is the only barrier against the ego's dissolution into the noise of the world and the inertia of lower onto-formations. Agonistic consciousness is that which detects the first signs of the will's desertion and intervenes to restore order, being a "**sentinel-consciousness**" that does not allow itself the luxury of relaxation.

This hyper-active state of vigilance prepares the ground for the sovereign exercise of **agency**. Without consciousness to maintain the map of internal conflict, agency would be a blind force; without agency to execute the decrees of consciousness, the latter would remain a mere analysis of failure. Thus, agonistic consciousness becomes the **condition of possibility for the person**, providing that space of tensional clarity in which the individual ceases to be carried by the flow of instincts and begins to dictate their own becoming. It is the measure of our **ontic density**: we are "persons" to the extent that our consciousness is capable

of sustaining and utilizing the structural antagonism of being, refusing refuge in the docile unconsciousness of automatism.

Agency and the Ego: Ontifying the Power to Produce Autonomy and Sovereignty

Agency represents the crucial moment and ontological breaking point where the person ceases to be a mere passive battlefield for the collision of onto-formations, transforming into the **sovereign force** that dictates the hierarchy of its own being. This is not a mere executive function, but the act by which the **ego** leaves its condition as a helpless witness of drives to claim its role as the architect of destiny. Agency requires the person to "inhabit" their acts with a total presence, refusing to be a mere transmission relay for external stimuli or organic instincts. Through this effort, the reflex reaction is transfigured into a historical fact with **ontological weight**, a process that resonates deeply with Viktor Frankl's "will to meaning": the individual no longer asks what life expects of them, but answers life by assuming every gesture as an irreversible decision.

In this agonistic perspective, agency is not a mere capacity to choose between pre-existing options—which would be a mere freedom of consumption—but the radical power to institute a **new causality**. It represents the capacity to wrest meaning from the claws of biological chance and statistical probability, imposing a direction where nature left only entropy. The ego thus becomes the **spearhead of the spirit**, validating Henri Bergson's thesis on the unceasing creativity of the *élan vital* against the automatisms of matter. Exercising agency means suspending the laws of psychic inertia to make room for an act of **pure will**, which is not explained by the past but justified by the future it opens.

Furthermore, sovereign agency is what allows the person to transcend prefabricated social roles. It is not content to "perform" according to cultural scripts but intervenes in reality as a force of **discontinuity**. This dynamic brings to mind Hannah Arendt's concept of "**action**," where to act means to initiate something new, to insert into the world a beginning that was not predictable in the sequence of prior causes. The ego, activated through agency, thus becomes the instance that transforms the individual from an object of history—carried by economic or sociological waves—into a subject who actively generates it, imprinting upon reality the **seal of its own sovereignty**.

This radical transformation makes possible the leap toward a **freedom** that is no longer just an abstract concept or a metaphysical debate, but an unyielding self-practice that imposes order upon existential chaos. Agency is, essentially, the instrument through which the person exercises their "**right of veto**" before the lower onto-formations. It is the measure of the power to remain master in a world that tends toward dissolution, transforming every second of existence into a battlefield where order is

conquered, maintained, and defended against any form of leveling automatism.

Freedom: The Great Escape or the Agonistic Process of Extraction from Determinism

Far from being a natural privilege, a biological heritage, or a physiological given guaranteed by the structure of the nervous system, **freedom** reveals itself as a laborious and often tensional process of **ontifying agency**. It is not an absence of constraints, but the deliberate exercise of the will against instinctual "gravity" and the external pressures of leveling that tend to reduce the person to the stage of a reactive object. Freedom is therefore constituted through the **forced imposition** of higher behavioral styles upon automatic reflexes, representing the stage victory of the spirit over biological determinism.

This perspective correlates deeply with Erich Fromm’s distinction regarding "**positive freedom**"—that freedom *to be*, to act, and to create agonistically through total and assumed commitment. Unlike negative freedom (the mere lack of barriers), **agonistic freedom** is a second-by-second conquest, an active wrenching from the flow of blind causality. It reflects the condition described by Jean-Paul Sartre, in which man is "condemned" to freedom precisely because he cannot take refuge in any predetermined essence or biological excuse; he is obliged to forge his identity through **choice**, even when this choice involves a painful conflict with the inertia of his own nature.

In the onto-agonistic view, freedom manifests as a **fierce resistance** to the mechanisms of self-preservation and the impulses of the organic onto-formation, which tend to sacrifice the verticality of the spirit upon the altar of comfort and least resistance. It thus becomes the exact measure of **Kantian autonomy of the will**—that sovereign instance that gives itself its own law in the hearth of the internal battle, refusing to be a slave to natural inclinations. Freedom is not a state of grace, but a function of effort; it is proportional to the **intensity of opposition** that the person manifests toward their own automatisms.

Furthermore, this freedom is akin to the "gratuitous act" or the **ethical heroism** described by Nicolai Hartmann, where the subject intervenes in the causal mechanism of the world to institute a new, teleological causality. The success of this unceasing struggle between consciousness and instinct is not just a moral triumph, but the only legitimate path toward an authentic and dense fulfillment. Freedom becomes, ultimately, the **ontological foundation of the person**: you are free only to the extent that you manage to be the cause of your own actions, transforming biological necessity into an opportunity to affirm the **sovereignty of the spirit**.

Fulfillment and Happiness: Plenitude Resulting from the Intensity of Confrontations

From this succession of agonistic victories, obtained in the hearth of the conflict between onto-formations, emerges a radical redefinition of **fulfillment and happiness**, viewed not as states of repose, relaxation, or ataraxia, but as experiences of **plenitude resulting from the intensity of confrontation** with the self and the world. This perspective overturns the modern paradigm of comfort, proposing an **agonistic happiness** that rejects facile hedonism and approaches the concept of Aristotelian *eudaimonia*, understood not as mere joy, but as an activity of the soul in accordance with excellence (*arete*). In this context, fulfillment is not a quiet destination or a port of arrival, but the feeling of **ontological density** that occurs when the person feels they have exercised their potential and agency to the maximum against the resistance of the world and the inertia of their own organism.

This dynamic resonates deeply with what Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi defines as the "**flow state**," but in the onto-agonistic model, this state is recharged with a tragic and heroic dimension: joy does not arise from facile fluidity, but from the **mastery of extreme difficulty**. It is a form of "will to power" in a Nietzschean sense, where happiness is defined by the feeling that resistance has been overcome. Thus, happiness becomes an **indicator of the person's integrative power**, a validation of the fact that the ego and consciousness have managed to maintain the hierarchy over divergent onto-formations in moments of maximum tension.

Moreover, this "**severe happiness**" mirrors Viktor Frankl’s concept of "will to meaning," suggesting that plenitude is not the absence of suffering, but the presence of a purpose capable of transfiguring the suffering of effort into fuel for **ontological pride**. Instead of *ataraxia* (tranquility freed from disturbance), the person seeks an intense state of vigilance, similar to the heroic ideal described by Ernst Jünger, where the individual finds fulfillment at the point of maximum pressure of events. Here, the suffering of internal effort is no longer ballast but becomes living proof of the functioning of **sovereign agency**; the greater the resistance of the onto-formations (the organism demanding rest or the soul seeking escape), the denser the victory of the person.

This state of plenitude projects itself authoritatively into the realm of conduct and social life, transforming the individual into a **pole of order**. Unlike the ephemeral happiness of consumption, agonistic happiness is cumulative and forges an **unshakable identity profile**. It validates the fact that the person has remained sovereign amidst the harshest tension, providing subjectivity with that "gravity" necessary to avoid being scattered by existential chance. Ultimately, this agonistic fulfillment demonstrates that man is not a system created for homeostasis and quietude, but a **tensional structure** that finds its ontological justification

only in the unceasing act of self-transcendence, transforming the battle with the self into the highest form of celebrating existence.

Social Life and Conduct : From Agonistic Intimacy to Civic Confrontation

Far from being a space of repose or docile integration, **conduct and social life** are constituted as the final external fronts where the person disputes their sovereignty against the centrifugal forces that tend to transform them into an interchangeable part, lost in the collective machinery. In this sphere of manifestation, the individual no longer faces only their own onto-formations but projects this **structural antagonism** upon the world, transforming interaction into three narrative levels of extreme tension, rigorously coordinated by their own agency.

Firstly, **personal life** ceases to be a passive refuge or a sphere of domestic comfort, revealing itself as a true **agonistic laboratory of intimacy**. This represents the first line of defense of the self against the depersonalizing siege of the mass and forced transparency. Here, the person does not rest but recalibrates their resistance through the process of **individuation**, forging uniqueness in a direct confrontation with their own "shadow." Far from being a space of abandonment, intimacy becomes the **fortress** where the subject refuses to become predictable or "readable," fiercely defending the boundary of exteriority against that amorphous "public" which seeks to dissolve the exception into the rule.

Moving into the plane of transformative action, **professional life and work** are redefined as a radical project of the self, transforming a career from an administrative path into a **theater of ontic operations**. Work is no longer a mere economic necessity, but the instrument through which the person shapes the world, overcoming alienation by transforming the professional act into a manifestation of **pure agency**. In this space, competence is not received but conquered through direct collision with matter and the rigidity of systems. The person imposes a **hierarchical excellence** and a rigor of execution that defies bureaucratic automatism and administrative inertia, transforming every task into a proof of sovereignty.

Finally, **civic and community life** crowns this journey through **agonism in the public space**, where the person’s presence becomes an act of ontological provocation. Comfortable integration is refused in favor of a presence that institutes order exclusively through **value-based confrontation** and distinction. Social relationship is no longer a contract of complacency but becomes, in the spirit of authentic dialogue, a **competition for the recognition of reciprocal sovereignty**. Citizenship is thus assumed as a position of strength, conquered through **moral courage** in the public arena, where action becomes the supreme form of personal differentiation. Through this active resistance to social leveling, the authentic person does not submit to a mechanical order but

participates in the creation of a **confederation of sovereign subjects**, where harmony does not derive from passive consensus, but from the fertile tension of freedoms that recognize and respect each other through the intensity of their common struggle for meaning.

Instead of Conclusions

Following this exploration of the architecture, dynamics, and finality of human personality and the person from an **onto-agonistic perspective**, it becomes evident that identity is not constituted as a static given, but as a **continuous emergence**, forged in the hearth of an unceasing confrontation between processes with divergent goals. While the initial premises established existence as a fragile armistice between impulse and norm, the present synthesis demonstrates that the transition from personality to person represents a **qualitative leap** toward sovereign agency. This presupposes the transformation of **temperament**, as a raw and often chaotic energy base, into a stable **character** capable of sustaining a coherent profile under the pressure of internal tensions. The person is not merely a passive ground where forces collide, but the authority that assumes the rigor of governing this **antagonism**, transforming the collision between its own ethical promergence and biological or social promergences into a force of impact upon the world.

We have observed how existential categories—work, conduct, fulfillment, and happiness—are not simple frameworks of manifestation, but **fronts** where the right to uniqueness is disputed against competing dismergent forces. **Work** ceases to be a mechanical chore, becoming the act through which the person imposes their will for order upon matter and systems, while **social conduct** becomes the visible expression of integrity conquered by managing the tensions between private interest and the public good. Thus, biological survival is transfigured into a meaningful, historical existence, capable of producing **ontological novelty** in a universe marked by the permanent collision of force systems, where the identity profile validates itself exclusively through **resistance**.

However, this model, though rigorously articulated, possesses **intrinsic limits** that may affect its universal validity. This perspective tends to elude the importance of states of **systemic relaxation**, theoretically interpreting any form of ease as an ontological surrender or a loss of character vigilance; this can lead to a representation of personality that is excessively strained, lacking conceptual mechanisms for self-regulation through rest. Furthermore, the theory presents the disadvantage of **restricted applicability**; by centering exclusively on sovereign agency, the model risks becoming an elitist construct that ignores the material, economic, or neurobiological constraints that can drastically limit an individual’s capacity for response. Another theoretical limit resides in the

possible neglect of **intersubjective dimensions** based on cooperation; the model risks reducing the entire phenomenology of social conduct to a succession of antagonistic relationships, ignoring the promergences resulting from synergy, empathy, and mutual support, which are as constitutive of the person as the struggle itself.

Despite these vulnerabilities, the onto-agonistic perspective offers a **robust interpretative grid** in spheres of application where character and decision-making are fundamental, such as education, leadership, or professional ethics. In **pedagogy**, this model shifts the focus from the mere accumulation of information to the formation of the will and intellectual resilience, preparing the individual for confrontation with a complex and contradictory reality. In the realm of **elite management**, the theory transforms work and career from an administrative routine into a project of affirming competence under hierarchical and systemic pressure. The major advantage of this model lies in its capacity to restore to the person the **dignity of a sovereign agent**, offering the opportunity for a moral recalibration in an era that tends to explain human behavior exclusively through external determinisms, whether social or algorithmic.

From this succession of emergent victories arising from an **assumed agonism**, a new understanding of personal fulfillment and happiness appears—viewed not as states of repose or the absence of conflict, but as experiences of **plenitude** resulting from the intensity of the confrontation with one's own internal tensions. The value of a person is measured by their capacity to sustain **paradox and tension** without being fragmented by the opposing processes that tend to absorb them, defining an **agonistic happiness** that arises from mastering extreme difficulty and from the forced harmonization of temperament with the ethical ideal. By reinstating the power to say "No" to impulse and "Yes" to the chosen value, the model paves the way for an **active citizenship**, where presence in the community produces order through excellence and assumed agonism.

Ultimately, the validity of this endeavor is confirmed by the fact that man never feels more alive than in moments of **maximum mobilization** of his internal resources, demonstrating that the true nature of personality is not simply to "be," but to **become**, unceasingly, through the sovereign effort to transcend one's own condition. This state of plenitude, conquered through a willed tension with the environment and the self, remains the only viable alternative in the face of contemporary **identity dissolution**. It promises not an illusory happiness based on facile comfort, but a **dense fulfillment** based on the recognition of one's own impact in the world and the capacity to remain a sovereign unity in the midst of dismergent chaos.

The Project: Agonistic Human Ontology

© Petru Stefaroi 2026